

Paragrassmann Algebras with Many Variables

A.T. Filippov*

I.N.F.N., Sezione di Torino, via P.Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino **Italy**

and

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, **Russia**[†]

A.B. Kurdikov [‡]

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, **Russia**

Abstract

This is a brief review of our recent work attempted at a generalization of the Grassmann algebra to the paragrassmann ones. The main aim is constructing an algebraic basis for representing ‘fractional’ symmetries appearing in $2D$ integrable models and also introduced earlier as a natural generalization of supersymmetries. We have shown that these algebras are naturally related to quantum groups with $q =$ root of unity. By now we have a general construction of the paragrassmann calculus with one variable and preliminary results on deriving a natural generalization of the Neveu–Schwarz–Ramond algebra. These results were very recently published in two papers (in collaboration with A.Isaev).

The main emphasis of this report is on a new general construction of paragrassmann algebras with any number of variables, N . It is shown that for the nilpotency indices $(p+1) = 3, 4, 6$ the algebras are almost as simple as the Grassmann algebra (for which $(p+1) = 2$). A general algorithm for deriving algebras with arbitrary p and N is also given. However, it is shown that this algorithm does not exhaust all possible algebras, and the simplest example of an ‘exceptional’ algebra is presented for $p = 4, N = 4$.

*supported in part by Russian Fund for Fundamental Research, grant number 93–02–3827

[†]Permanent Address

[‡]supported in part by Russian Fund for Fundamental Research, grant number 93–02–3827

We start with a brief report ¹ on our recent results on constructing paragrassmann algebras with many variables. A detailed motivation and our previous results may be found in Refs.[1], [2], [3] where references to other related papers can also be found. As our approach is distinctly different from other attempts in the same direction we first outline general principles we use in this construction. Mathematically, our approach is to derive a correct para-generalization of the classical fermionic algebra ($i=1, \dots, N$):

$$\theta_i^2 = 0, \quad \partial_i^2 = 0. \quad (1)$$

$$\theta_i \theta_j = -\theta_j \theta_i, \quad \partial_i \partial_j = -\partial_j \partial_i. \quad (2)$$

$$\partial_i \theta_j = -\theta_j \partial_i, \quad \partial_i \theta_i = -\theta_i \partial_i + 1. \quad (3)$$

For the moment, the prefix *para* means that the first equation is replaced by the so called *p*-nilpotency condition:

$$\theta_i^{p+1} = 0 = \partial_i^{p+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

To see what might be called a *correct generalization* of other two equations we have to discuss them in more detail.

Eqs.(1, 2) guarantee that any linear combination of θ_i is nilpotent, and the same is true for ∂_i . Using Eqs.(2, 3) one can change the order of the products of the variables θ_i and derivatives ∂_i . It is convenient to rewrite Eq.(3) as

$$\partial_i \theta_j = \delta_{ij} - \theta_j \partial_i. \quad (4)$$

In this form one easily recognizes the commutation relations between the Fermi creation and annihilation operators (the only difference is that θ are not supposed to be Hermitian conjugate of ∂). Having in mind this analogy, it is natural to define a vacuum vector $|0\rangle$,

$$\partial_i |0\rangle = 0,$$

and to construct 2^N independent states

$$\theta_N^{k_N} \dots \theta_1^{k_1} |0\rangle = |k_1 \dots k_N\rangle,$$

where $k_i = 0$ or 1 . With the corresponding dual (conjugate) vacuum, vanishing under the action of θ_i from the right, one can construct 2^N conjugate states $\langle k_1 \dots k_N|$. This gives 2^N -dimensional Fock representation for θ and ∂ as well as for any polynomial of them.

Thus the above relations guarantee necessary physical properties of the variables and derivatives (viewed as creation and annihilation operators). But, is the reverse statement true? In other words, is the above Grassmann algebra uniquely defined by some natural physical requirements? Speaking rigorously, we should use the term ‘Grassmann algebra’ only for the algebra of the variables θ while the algebra of both variables and derivatives is better to be called ‘Grassmann differential calculus’. For the sake of brevity we will often neglect this tiny distinction.

It is easy to prove that the algebra of the variables θ_i is uniquely defined by the condition that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N c_i \theta_i \right)^2 = 0. \quad (5)$$

¹This is partly based on the reports presented to the Smorodinsky Workshop on Group Theory in Physics, Dubna, July 1993

The same is true for the derivatives ∂_i . This condition is quite natural as it says that any superposition of the Fermi states also satisfies the exclusion principle. More difficult is to understand the nature of Eq.(4). One may try a more general but still natural and simple bilinear *ansatz*

$$\partial_i \theta_j = \delta_{ij} + R_{ij}^{kl} \theta_l \partial_k ,$$

where the summation over k, l is assumed. However it is not difficult to prove that Eqs.(1, 2) and associativity of the multiplication in our algebra require

$$R_{ij}^{kl} = -\delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} .$$

Thus Eq.(4) is the most general bilinear expression for $\partial_i \theta_j$ with the anticommuting Grassmann variables and derivatives. One might try to further generalize this result but we end our discussion of the Grassmann case and turn to more fundamental, paragrassmann generalizations. Our approach to constructing paragrassmann algebras and calculus is to follow, as close as possible, to the Grassmann pattern briefly described above (for a more mathematical treatment and physics applications of the Grassmann calculus see Ref.[4]).

Let us first fix the notation. An algebra generated by N p -nilpotent variables θ_i , with some (to be found below) generalized ‘commutation’ relations between them, will be denoted by $\Gamma_p(N)$. An algebra generated by both θ_i and ∂_i will be denoted by $\Pi_p(N)$. Both p and N could be omitted in clear situations. So the fermionic algebra given by Eqs.(1, 2, 5) is called $\Pi_1(N)$ in our notation, while the algebra generated by θ ’s only, i.e. the standard Grassmann algebra known in the last century, is denoted by $\Gamma_1(N)$. We usually call ‘paragrassmann algebra’ both Γ and Π though the latter is in fact a generalization of the Grassmann calculus and should be called paragrassmann calculus.

It is clear that $\Gamma_p(1)$, the algebra of one variable θ , is a well known object $k[\theta]/(\theta^{p+1})$. Here k is the principal field (or ring), say the field of complex numbers or complex functions. The latter is needed for constructing a para-super geometry but we will not address this extremely difficult topic here; first steps in this direction were attempted in [3]. The algebras $\Pi_p(1)$ were described in [2]. As was shown there, each algebra $\Pi_p(1)$ is defined by p independent complex numbers α_n , so that (recall that $\partial_i |0\rangle = 0$):

$$\partial \theta^n |0\rangle = \alpha_n \theta^{n-1} |0\rangle, \quad n = 1, \dots, p .$$

All algebras with nonvanishing α_n are called nondegenerate, and they are mathematically equivalent. So we call them ‘versions’ of the same algebra. This does not necessarily imply their physical equivalence. For example, for the physicist it would be strange to identify parabosons with parafermions (see [5], [6], [7]). Nevertheless, the algebras describing them may be obtained by our general procedure and they correspond to two different non-degenerate systems of the parameters α .

An alternative and equivalent way of defining the para-derivative ∂ is to write the operator (matrix) relation

$$\partial \theta = b_0 + b_1 \theta \partial + \dots + b_p \theta^p \partial^p ,$$

where the parameters b_i satisfy one equation, which follows from the identity $\partial \theta^{p+1} \equiv 0$. In terms of this relation the simplest version is defined by the bilinearity requirement which by simple calculations and normalizing θ reduces to

$$\partial \theta = 1 + q \theta \partial ,$$

where q is any primitive root of unity (i.e. $q^{p+1} = 1$ and $q^k \neq 1$ for smaller k). Thus the bilinear version of the paragrassmann algebra $\Pi_p(1)$ is the closest one to the Grassmann algebra $\Pi_1(1)$.

Here we will discuss the algebras $\Gamma_p(N)$. As we have shown in the above references (and will be demonstrated more generally below) there are many nonequivalent algebras for given p and N but there exist important exceptions to this general rule. This statement is true even for the simplest bilinear algebras that we have studied so far. The non-bilinear algebras are not well understood but we hope that the bilinear algebras are most important for physics applications. They are also much simpler to work with and natural physical (or geometrical) conditions usually lead to the bilinear case (see [3]).

The first quite natural requirement for paragrassmann algebras of many variables is that any linear combination of θ_i should be p -nilpotent, which means that for any choice of the complex numbers c_i

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N c_i \theta_i\right)^{p+1} = 0 , \quad (6)$$

and thus the variables θ_i generate the linear space over complex numbers. As the coefficients c_i are simply commuting, this condition is equivalent to the following set of $(p+1)$ -linear equations

$$\sum_{\sigma} \theta_{\sigma(i_0)} \dots \theta_{\sigma(i_p)} = 0 ,$$

where the sum is taken over all different permutations, σ , of the set

$$I = \{i_0, \dots, i_p\} , \quad i_k \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

One could try to treat these monstrous sums as analogues of the anticommutators but that would fast lead to a dead end. So, to proceed with developing a paragrassmann calculus some further restrictions must be imposed on the nilpotent variables. Here is a branching point since these restrictions are to be made by hands and depend on what do we want of the paragrassmann algebras. To make our choice more clear we remind some history of the paragrassmann algebras and motives of our investigation.

In fact, the history of the paragrassmann algebras can be traced back to the earliest days of quantum theory. A sort of a para-Clifford algebra (with unipotent variables) was introduced by Hermann Weyl in twenties. In sixties, Julian Schwinger used Weyl's ideas for regularizing quantum field theories but then left the general approach and concentrated on the Grassmann algebra. A different development started in fifties with the aim to clarify the parastatistics problem. First remarkable results had been obtained by H.S.Green [5] and D.V.Volkov [6]. The work in subsequent decades had been summarized in [7].

The central characters of that 'old testament' were quantum fields, subjected to parastatistics, i.e. having p -fold degeneracy in symmetric ('parafermions') or skew symmetric ('parabosons') states. Paragrassmann algebras appeared there as a somewhat auxiliary tool in a framework of the so called *Green ansatz*. It consists of representing each θ_i by the sum of p Grassmann numbers,

$$\theta_i = \sum_{\alpha=1}^p \zeta_i^{(\alpha)} ,$$

with the following commutation relations for the components

$$\zeta_i^{(\alpha)} \zeta_j^{(\beta)} = (-)^{\delta_{\alpha\beta}} \zeta_j^{(\beta)} \zeta_i^{(\alpha)} .$$

The p -nilpotency of θ 's is obviously guaranteed, and also it is easy to check that

$$[\theta_i, \theta_j] = 2 \sum_{\alpha} \zeta_i^{(\alpha)} \zeta_j^{(\alpha)} ,$$

and therefore

$$[[\theta_i, \theta_j], \theta_k] = 0 .$$

This trilinear condition had been taken as a basic identity for the generators, in addition to nilpotency. Being combined with (6) it leads to some simplifications, like $\theta_i \theta_j \theta_k + \theta_k \theta_i \theta_j = 0$ for $p = 2$, but clearly can never produce any bilinear identities and, therefore, commutation formulas. The correspondent differential calculi are also essentially multilinear and rather messy, making it hard to get any far-reaching results, except for the simplest case $p = 2$.

A new philosophy was suggested by two-dimensional conformal field theories, where fields of fractional spin appear quite naturally. In fact, our approach (see [1], [2], [3]) arose in the course of search for a geometric meaning of conformal algebras and of their representations by generalized differential operators. A central object in this context is a fractional derivative $\mathcal{D}$, ($\mathcal{D}^{p+1} = \partial_z$), that transforms fields of the conformal weight λ into ones of the weight $\lambda + 1/(p+1)$. Such a derivative has a natural paragrassmann representation

$$\mathcal{D} = \partial + \kappa \theta^p \partial_z , \tag{7}$$

where ∂ and θ generate what we call $\Pi_p(1)$, and κ is a normalization coefficient. (Note that this way of writing a formal root of any operator was more or less widely known for some time; it is certainly not our invention.) It is seen from (7) that ∂ and θ must have conformal dimension $\pm 1/(p+1)$. As the Grassmann numbers have dimension $1/2$, Green's construction is incompatible with the above consideration. Once we insisted on importance of the fractional derivative we had to try a new start in the paragrassmann business, throwing away the Green ansatz however clever it was.

Note that some similar attempts can be found in recent literature, usually in the context of so called 'fractional supersymmetry' (references can be found in our papers quoted above). By the way, we think that the terms 'fractional supersymmetry', and even more, 'fractional Grassmann algebras' sound a bit strange because, if anything there is fractional, that is the conformal dimension or the derivative but the symmetry and algebras are no more 'fractional' than the standard supersymmetry which is never called 'fractional'. For this reason, we prefer to speak about *parasupersymmetry* and *paragrassmann algebras*, keeping in mind, that they have nothing to do with Green's approach (with these reservations, we also sometimes use the term 'fractional' for paragrassmann algebras and symmetries). Though the simplest things, like Eq.(7) or particular paragrassmann algebras, were known for some time, it seems that the full depth and richness of the subject has not been realized so far. This is particularly true for the paragrassmann algebras with many variables which are the main subject of this report.

Another desirable property of the paragrassmann algebras dictated by applications is existence of bilinear identities between the variables and, even more important, the possibility of a normal ordering of them. To formulate this more precisely let us denote by $\Gamma^{(m)}$ the subspace of m -linear polynomials in θ_i . Then the set of ordered monomials

$$\theta_{i_1} \dots \theta_{i_m} , \quad i_1 \geq i_2 \geq \dots \geq i_m \tag{8}$$

must form an additive basis of $\Gamma^{(m)}$. A sufficient condition for this is provided by ‘commutation’ relations of the type ($i < j$):

$$\theta_i \theta_j = \sum_{k < l \leq j} R_{ij}^{kl} \theta_l \theta_k, \quad l > k. \quad (9)$$

The restrictions on the indices allow one to reorder the variables θ_i even for infinite number of the variables. More general bilinear relations might be used with this aim but we need not consider them here. The matrix R must satisfy some additional relations similar to those known in the theory of the Yang–Baxter equations and of the quantum groups (see [11], [12], [13]). We will not discuss these topics here but it is worth noticing that the commutation relation of this sort are usually discussed without adding the nilpotency condition (6) which is in fact the heart of our approach.

Note that the requirement of normal ordering guarantees a ‘para-supersymmetric’ structure of the space $\Gamma_p(N)$ generalizing the supersymmetric structure of the space $\Gamma_1(N)$ in the following sense. Let us divide the space of all polynomials of θ_i into subspaces having the same degree modulo $p+1$:

$$\Gamma^{[M]} = \bigoplus_{m=M \bmod (p+1)} \Gamma^{(m)}, \quad \gamma_m = \dim \Gamma^{(m)}.$$

Then the dimensions of all $\Gamma^{[M]}$ do not depend on M and are equal to $(p+1)^{N-1}$. This immediately follows from the identity

$$(1 + x + \dots + x^p)^N = \sum_{m \geq 0} \gamma_m x^m.$$

This property of the Grassmann algebras explains their usefulness for formulating supersymmetries, we suggest to call it ‘rudimentary supersymmetry’ (meaning that it needs no Lagrangians or Hamiltonians and is formulated in terms of the space of states). The generalization suggested here might be called a ‘rudimentary para-supersymmetry’ and it probably will constitute a basis for a more general approach to para-supersymmetric physical systems introduced earlier in terms of special representations for θ -variables (see [8] and further references in our papers quoted above).

Now we have to recall that our main aim is to satisfy the nilpotency condition (6). However, this problem proves to be very difficult to solve for the general bilinear commutation relations (9). To be able to find algebras for arbitrary values of p and of N we thus are forced to make a simple enough *ansatz* for R . Namely, we suppose that there exists a basis $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N$ in $\Gamma^{(1)}$ for which the R -matrix is diagonal

$$R_{ij}^{kl} = \delta_i^k \delta_j^l r_{ij}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \theta_i \theta_j = r_{ij} \theta_j \theta_i. \quad (10)$$

In other words, we impose a multi-grading $\deg_i \theta_j = \delta_{ij}$ (and, correspondingly, $\deg_i \partial_j = \delta_{ij}$ for Π), which must be preserved under commutation. It seems to be the strongest requirement we can impose.

In terms of the commutation relations (10) our problem can now be formulated in the following form: *to find all admissible sets of r_{ij}* , i.e. those for which all the equations (6) are satisfied.

To formulate this problem in more precise terms let us define

$$\{\theta_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, \theta_N^{(k_N)}\} = \sum_{\sigma} \theta_{\sigma(1)} \dots \theta_{\sigma(p+1)},$$

where the sum is taken over all permutations of the multiset $K = \{1^{k_1}, \dots, N^{k_N}\}$, $k_i \geq 0$, $k_1 + \dots + k_N = p + 1$ (the meaning of the notation for the multiset or the multi-index must be clear – each number i is taken k_i times. These brackets naturally appear in calculating

$$(\theta_1 + \dots + \theta_N)^{p+1} = \sum_K \{\theta_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, \theta_N^{(k_N)}\} .$$

Here the sum is taken over all $(p+1)$ -submultisets K (introduced above) of the big multiset $Z = \{1^p, \dots, N^p\}$. Using the commutation relations we can write all these brackets in the normal ordered form:

$$\{\theta_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, \theta_N^{(k_N)}\} = P_K(r_{ij}) \theta_N^{k_N} \dots \theta_1^{k_1} .$$

where P_K are polynomials of r_{ij} . To guarantee the nilpotency property r_{ij} have to be chosen so that all polynomials are zero. At the moment, we do not know explicit expressions or simple recurrence formulae for these polynomials and, of course, we can not make any general statement about their zeroes. So we will try to move step by step attempting to reduce the general case to the simplest ones.

The simplest thing is to consider a subalgebra $\Gamma(2)$ generated by two variables. It is completely solved by the following

Lemma 1. r_{ij} is a primitive root of unity, i.e. has the form

$$r_{ij} = q^{\rho_{ij}} \quad , \quad q = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{p+1}\right) , \quad (11)$$

where $\rho_{ij} \in \mathbf{I}_{p+1}$ – the multiplicative group of invertible elements of the ring $\mathbf{Z}_{p+1}$. In other words, the set of numbers which are less than $p+1$ and are relatively prime to it (i.e. having no common divisors with $p+1$). The statement of the lemma follows directly from the simple fact:

$$P_{k, p+1-k}(r) = \frac{(p+1)_r!}{(p+1-k)_r! (k)_r!} , \quad (12)$$

where we use the standard notation

$$(n)_r = \frac{r^n - 1}{r - 1} , \quad (n)_r! = (n)_r (n-1)_r \dots (1)_r .$$

Polynomials (12) are the well-known Gauss polynomials (or the r -binomial coefficients), and clearly all of them are zero iff $r^{p+1} = 1$ and $r^k \neq 1$, $k < p+1$.

Some words should be said about the groups $\mathbf{I}_{p+1}$ because they play a crucial (though not obvious) role in the whole our construction. They are abelian groups of order $\varphi(p+1)$ (this is the Euler function giving the number of positive integers that are less than $p+1$ and relatively prime to it) and therefore must be isomorphic to direct products of simple cyclic groups $\mathbf{C}_{p^n}$. As they are not well known to physicists, we present below a few

examples of them (with the correspondent residues in parentheses):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_3 &\simeq \mathbf{I}_4 \simeq \mathbf{I}_6 \simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) , \\
\mathbf{I}_5 &\simeq \mathbf{C}_4(1, 2, -1, -2) , \\
\mathbf{I}_7 &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_3(1, 2, 4) \simeq \mathbf{C}_6 , \\
\mathbf{I}_8 &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_2(1, 3) , \\
\mathbf{I}_9 &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_3(1, -2, 4) \simeq \mathbf{C}_6 , \\
\mathbf{I}_{10} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_4(1, 3, -1, -3) , \\
\mathbf{I}_{11} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_5(1, -2, 4, -8, 5) \simeq \mathbf{C}_{10} , \\
\mathbf{I}_{12} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_2(1, 5) , \\
\mathbf{I}_{13} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_3(1, 3, 9) \times \mathbf{C}_4(1, 5, -1, -5) \simeq \mathbf{C}_{12} , \\
\mathbf{I}_{14} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_3(1, -2, 4) \simeq \mathbf{C}_6 , \\
\mathbf{I}_{15} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_4(1, 2, 4, 8) , \\
\mathbf{I}_{16} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_4(1, 5, 9, 13) , \\
\mathbf{I}_{17} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_{16} , \\
\mathbf{I}_{18} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_3(1, 7, 13) , \\
\mathbf{I}_{19} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_9 \simeq \mathbf{C}_{18} , \\
\mathbf{I}_{20} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_4(1, 3, 9, 7) , \\
\ldots &\quad \ldots \ldots \ldots \\
\mathbf{I}_{24} &\simeq \mathbf{C}_2(1, -1) \times \mathbf{C}_2(1, 5) \times \mathbf{C}_2(1, 7) .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, all $\Gamma_p(2)$ are very simply classified. Once it has been done, a possibility of an inductive construction of $\Gamma_p(N)$ arises (special examples of this new general construction were given in our papers [1], [2]; the reader is advised to consult these papers for a better understanding of the general idea). Thus we start with a single θ , then replace it by a linear combination of two θ 's, generating $\Gamma(2)$, then this operation can be applied to any of these new θ 's, and so on (we will call this a *telescopic construction*). In this way, after $N - 1$ steps we get a paragrassmann algebra with N variables. This algebra can be visualized by a tree having the root, N free ends numbered from left to right by $1, 2 \dots N$, and $N - 1$ vertices, labelled by some integers $\rho_m \in \mathbf{I}_{p+1}$. We assume that the branches growing from the same vertex are ordered from *left* to *right*). The commutation relations can be read from the tree as follows: if the end i belongs to a *left* sequence of branches and the end j belongs to a *right* sequence of branches both growing from the same vertex labelled by ρ_m , then

$$\theta_i \theta_j = q^{\rho_m} \theta_j \theta_i .$$

Let us call paragrassmann algebras of the described kind *maximal*, in a sense to be clarified later.

Clearly, the trees that can be transformed into each other by a sequence of transformations like " $\rho_m \rightarrow -\rho_m$; *left* $\leftrightarrow$ *right* at the vertex m " correspond to equivalent algebras. The algebras obtained by a re-numbering θ 's are also identical. It is also reasonable to factor out the action of the group $\mathbf{I}_{p+1} : \rho_{ij} \rightarrow \sigma \rho_{ij}$, $\sigma \in \mathbf{I}_{p+1}$ (because q may denote any primitive root of unity in (11)). Note, that $\sigma = -1$ is equivalent to the re-ordering, so in fact we have factored out the group $S_N \times \mathbf{I}_{p+1}/\mathbf{C}_2$. The problem of equivalence becomes more and more complex as p and N grow but it is clear that there *exist* non-equivalent algebras for any values of p and N . This is a new feature of the paragrassmann algebras as compared to the Grassmann case, where the algebra was completely determined by N ($p = 1$). We will show that the paragrassmann algebras are completely fixed by N only for $p = 2, 3, 5$ when the unique equivalence class exists.

Remark in passing that the integer-valued matrix ρ_{ij} has a deeper meaning than r_{ij} defined in (10). If we denote $w^a = \theta_1^{a_1} \theta_2^{a_2} \dots \theta_N^{a_N}$ and $w^a w^b = q^{[a,b]} w^b w^a$, then it is easy to show that

$$[a, b] = \rho_{ij} a_i b_j .$$

So ρ_{ij} plays the role of a skew-symmetric 2-form in the vector space of vectors a enumerating the monomials in $\Gamma_p(N)$.

Let us return to the above telescopic construction. It is clear that it can be generalized in the following way. Namely, if we already have got two paragrassmann algebras $\Gamma_p(N)$ and $\Gamma_p(M)$, then another algebra of $N + M - 1$ variables can be obtained via replacing some θ_i of the first algebra by an arbitrary linear combination of M generators of the second one. Let us call this new algebra the *telescoping product* of the two algebras. The best way to describe it is to use tree graphs similar to that described above. We will not go into a detailed description of this construction. The only important thing is to understand that, by the telescoping procedure, all possible algebras can be made of irreducible, indecomposable blocks having only one vertex. Such building blocks we call *minimal* algebras. In summary, the structure of the complex paragrassmann algebras depends not only on their minimal building blocks but also on the way of combining them into the structure represented by the tree diagram described above.

Thus, to classify paragrassmann algebras we have to find all minimal algebras and to find criteria of equivalence of algebras corresponding to different trees. We will not go into a discussion of the equivalence problem and only briefly summarize what we know about minimal algebras. A series of the minimal algebras for any p is given by the described above algebras $\Gamma_p(2)$. Until recently we believed that there is no other minimal algebras. However, below we present an example of a minimal algebra $\Gamma_4(4)$. In fact, it is the only example we presently know. We think that algebras of this sort are really exceptional and do not exist for large values of p and N .

Let us proceed with analyzing $N = 3$ subalgebras. We believe that there are no minimal algebras with three generators (in fact, we have an incomplete proof of this statement which is valid for almost all values of $p+1$). This means that, for any admissible set of r_{ij} , two of the three numbers r_{ij}, r_{jk}, r_{ki} must be mutually inverse for any choice of i, j, k (mind that the order of the indices is cyclic). If we visualize the paragrassmann algebra with N variables by a complete (full) graph with N vertices and $N(N-1)/2$ oriented edges $i \rightarrow j$ labelled by the numbers ρ_{ij} , the above statement means that all triangles in the graph are isosceles (e.g. $\rho_{ij} = \rho_{ik}$).

We will not present here even a sketch of the proof and only give the first step of it which is useful by itself. This is

Lemma 2. The equality

$$r_{ij} = r_{jk} = r_{ki} = q , \tag{13}$$

where q is any primitive root of unity (i.e. $q^{p+1} = 1$ and $q^k \neq 1$ for smaller k) is *not admissible*.

This can be seen from the following expression for the simplest $N = 3$ polynomial

$$P_{p-1,1,1}(q, q, q^{-1}) = (p+1)(q+1) \neq 0 , \tag{14}$$

where the polynomial is defined by

$$\{\theta_i^{(p-1)}, \theta_j, \theta_k\} = P_{p-1,1,1}(r_{ij}, r_{jk}, r_{ik}) \theta_i^{(p-1)} \theta_j \theta_k$$

and can be calculated recursively.

An immediate consequence of this Lemma is the complete classification for the cases $p = 2, 3, 5$. Indeed, in these cases $\rho_{ij} = \pm 1$, and so precisely two of the three numbers in (13) are equal. Let us assume that they are r_{ij} and r_{jk} . If so, define the ordering of the vertices in the graph by saying that $i \prec j \prec k$. It is easy to show that the transitivity of the ordering follows from the Lemma and so all θ_i are ordered. Then we obviously can re-number the θ 's so that the $\prec$ -relation matches the standard lexicographical ordering of the indices. Therefore for $p = 2, 3, 5$ paragrassmann algebras $\Gamma_p(N)$ are uniquely defined for any N by the simple q -commutation relations

$$\theta_i \theta_j = q \theta_j \theta_i, \quad i < j.$$

Of course, these relations define paragrassmann algebras for any values of N and p but for $p \neq 2, 3, 5$ they are not unique as we have shown above.

Moreover, there exists at least one minimal algebra not coinciding with $\Gamma_p(2)$. Consider possible choices of the ρ -matrices for $N = 4$, $p = 4$ (satisfying all the restrictions formulated above, including the requirement that all triangles are isosceles). Then we have

$$\rho_{12} = \rho_{14} = \rho_{34} = 1, \quad \rho_{13} = \rho_{23} = \rho_{24} = a, \quad (15)$$

where $a = 1, 2, 3$. The choice $a = 1$ gives the above non-minimal algebra and it is easy to prove that for $a = 3$ the matrix is not admissible. But a direct check shows that *for $a = 2$ the matrix (15) is admissible, and therefore the algebra described by it is a minimal paragrassmann algebra.*

As it is easy to see, this algebra is *exceptional* in any possible sense. Indeed, the case $p = 4$ is exceptional, since in it there is only *one* (modulo cyclic permutation) polynomial with four non-zero k 's, namely $P_{1,1,1,2}$, and it prohibits only one of the two possibilities ($a = 3$). As the number of non-equivalent polynomials is fast growing with p , it seems unlikely that something similar could happen for large p , and minimal algebras must really be very rare exceptions. Unfortunately, at the moment we do not know how to treat the general case.

Summarizing present status of the paragrassmann algebras, we wish to emphasize the fact that there exist some algebras for any N that are almost as simple as the Grassmann algebras but, in general, the 'para-world' is much richer than the 'super-world'. Two main unsolved problems of the $\Gamma_p(N)$ algebras theory are: 1. to construct *all* possible minimal algebras; 2. to find to what extent the diagonalizable R -matrices represent the class of all admissible ones.

The next topic that has to be discussed is how to construct differential calculi like those suggested in [9]. This problem has been essentially solved in our papers [1], [2]. There it was demonstrated that a larger set of the algebras Π exists in our case, and we succeeded in classifying them by using a species of tree graphs (see [2], the general consideration of this reference can easily be adapted to general algebras Γ constructed here). Earlier we have discussed in some detail the relation of the paragrassmann algebras to quantum groups and q -deformed oscillators with $q = \text{root of unity}$ (see [11], [12], [13], [10]). We have shown that bilinear paragrassmann algebras are most directly related to the representations of quantum groups with $q = \text{root of unity}$. The new results on $\Gamma_p(N)$ presented above give even more support to this conclusion. The connection is not so clear for non-bilinear algebras (not treated here) and, in addition, it is not so direct as it seems

at first sight (because of our emphasis on the nilpotency condition (6)). Due to this, our algebras in simplest cases are indeed direct generalizations of the Grassmann calculus (see also [3] for a definition of integration in paragrassmann variables and of simplest paraconformal transformations – para-translations, para-inversions, etc.).

Nevertheless, possible applications of the paragrassmann algebras may be in the problems in which quantum groups are useful. These include rational conformal theories [11], [12], [13] and, more generally, integrable models [11], [14]. We hope that the extension of possible dynamical symmetries (para-supersymmetries, para-conformal symmetries, etc.) which is provided by paragrassmann calculus may prove important for applications to physical systems even in more than two space-time dimensions.

The final version of this report is significantly different from that presented at the Smorodinsky Workshop. We have omitted almost all published results and added new results obtained after the Workshop.

For useful discussions of the preliminary versions of our report we would like to thank A.P.Isaev and A.A.Vladimirov. This work would be never finished without continuous kind support of V.de Alfaro and A.Salam to whom one of the authors (A.T.F.) expresses his deepest gratitude. Useful discussions of the results with L.Alvarez-Gaume, M.Mintchev and I.Todorov are acknowledged. Kind hospitality and financial support of ICTP (Trieste), the Turin Section of INFN, and of the Physics Department of the University of Turin are appreciated by one of the authors (A.T.F.).

References

- [1] A.T. Filippov, A.P. Isaev and A.B. Kurdikov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A7** (1992) 2129.
- [2] A.T. Filippov, A.P. Isaev and A.B. Kurdikov, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **94** (1990) 213.
- [3] A.T. Filippov, A.P. Isaev and A.B. Kurdikov, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A8** (1993) 4973.
- [4] F.A. Berezin, *Introduction into Algebra and Analysis with Anticommuting Variables*, Moscow State University Press, 1983 (in Russian);
R. Casalbuoni, *Nuovo Cim.*, **A33** (1976) 389.
- [5] H.S.Green, *Phys.Rev.* **90** (1953) 270.
- [6] D.V.Volkov, *Soviet Phys. JETP* **9** (1959) 1107.
- [7] Y.Ohnuki and S.Kamefuchi, *Quantum Field Theory and Parastatistics*, Univ. of Tokyo Press, Springer, 1982;
A.B. Govorkov, *Sov. J. Part. Nucl.* **14** (1983) 520.
- [8] V.A. Rubakov and V.P. Spiridonov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A3** (1988) 1337;
V.P. Spiridonov, *J. Phys.* **A24** (1991) L529.
- [9] J. Wess and B. Zumino, *Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.)* **18B** (1990) 302;
D.B. Fairly and C.K. Zachos, *Phys. Lett.* **B256** (1991) 43.
- [10] L. Biedenharn, *J. Phys.* **A22** (1989) L873;
A. MacFarlane, *J. Phys.* **A22** (1989) 4581.
- [11] L.D. Faddeev, N.Yu. Reshetikhin and L.A. Takhtajan, *Algebra i Analis* **1** (1989) 178 (in Russian, English translation: *Leningrad Math. J.* **1** (1990) 193).
- [12] L. Alvarez-Gaume, C. Gomez and G. Sierra, in: *Physics and Mathematics of Strings*, Eds. L Brink, D. Friedan and A. Polyakov, World Sci., Singapore, 1990.
- [13] I.T. Todorov and Ya.S. Stanev, *Chiral Current Algebras and 2-Dimensional Conformal Models*, lectures at the Lausanne University, Lausanne, 1992.
- [14] A. LeClair and C. Vafa, *Quantum Affine Symmetry as Generalized Supersymmetry*, preprint CLNS 92/1150 Cornell, 1992.